



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/805,224	03/22/2004	Long Yu	21854-00019-US1	9134
30678 7590 07/19/2007 CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP 1875 EYE STREET, N.W. SUITE 1100 WASHINGTON, DC 20036			EXAMINER NUTTER, NATHAN M	
			ART UNIT 1711	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/19/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/805,224	YU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nathan M. Nutter	1711	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11,12,14,15,20 and 22-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11,12,14,15,20 and 22-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The following is placed in effect in response to the amendment of 9 July 2007.

The rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement, is hereby expressly withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 11-17 and 20-27 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Peltonen et al (US 6,780,903), is hereby expressly withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 11-17 and 20-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Haasmaa et al (US 6,656,984), is hereby expressly withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 11, 12, 14, 15, 20 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The recitation of "substantially soluble in water" finds no support in the Specification, as originally filed.

Art Unit: 1711

The Specification reads "can be compressed into a small disposable pellet," which concept says nothing about solubility of constituents.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 11, 12, 14, 15, 20 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Silbiger et al (US 6,248,838), taken in view of Buehler et al (US 5,316,578) and Frische et al (US 5,374,304).

The reference to Silbiger et al (US 6,248,838) shows the employment of hydroxyalkyl starch at a presence of from 3 to 50 % by weight, polyvinyl alcohol at a presence of from 5 to 40 % by weight, water at about 6 to 20% by weight, glycerol at a level of 0.5 to 40 % by weight, and starch. Note the paragraph bridging column 3 to column 4, column 6 (lines 19-63) for the PVA, HA starch and glycerol plasticizer. Note column 8 (lines 17 et seq.) for the additional un-modified starch. The reference fails to teach the employment of a fatty acid or salt, as claimed.

The reference to Buehler et al (US 5,316,578) shows the employment of hydroxyalkyl starch at an unspecified range, though the product is drawn to a starch melt indicating major quantities, and by calculation of the other constituents as to their

Art Unit: 1711

respective inclusions, would certainly be within the range recited and claimed herein.

Water is present at about to 12% by weight, glycerol at a level of 4.8-39.8% by weight, and metal stearate at a level of 0.1 to 2% by weight. Note column 3 (lines 7-45) for the HA starch, water, plasticizer and metal stearates. The reference fails to show the inclusion of a PVA constituent.

The patent to Frische et al (US 5,374,304) shows the employment of hydroxyalkyl starch at a presence of from 60 to 97 % by weight, polyvinyl alcohol at a presence of from 3 to 40 % by weight, water, glycerol at a level of 3 to 40 % by weight. Note column 4 (lines 1-39) and the Examples. The patent fails to show the fatty acid or salt. The reference teaches the use of high amylase starch throughout.

The references taken together show the conventionality of the constituents employed and that these constituents are used in essentially overlapping, inclusive parameters as those recited and claimed herein. The several components, thus, have conventional and known uses to those having an ordinary skill in the art as regards the production of biodegradable compositions, as disclosed and recited herein. Further, since these constituents would not be found in any one reference, interpolation of the exact weight percentages for each separate compound need not be shown by any of the several references included in the rejection. The various components are shown by the references to be known in the production of biodegradable composites and would be used in accordance with the desired characteristics of the final composition as well as cost, availability and other factors of manufacturing and handling. Manipulation of the various components as to inclusion parameters would have been obvious modifications

to an artisan in view of these considerations. As such, the instant claims are deemed to be obvious over the teachings of the references. No unexpected results have been shown on the record relating to any particular component or inclusion of any components.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9 July 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With regard to the rejection of claims 11-17 and 20-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Silbiger et al (US 6,248,838), taken in view of Buehler et al (US 5,316,578) and Frische et al (US 5,374,304), applicants infer that the choice of any particular starch from that disclosed by Silbiger et al would be a burdensome one. A skilled artisan would know how to choose constituents from the Silbiger et al reference. Applicants imply that science and progress are held in a void. Applicants are reminded that a reference is taken for the entirety of its teachings and not for isolated passages relied upon to assert patentability. Applicants have not shown why the constituents employed, as shown by the references separately and together, as pointed out above, are not conventional and are not used conventionally. With regard to applicants' "experimental data," it is pointed out that the references shown sufficient guidance to manufacture the instant composition. The reference to Frische shows the use of high amylase starch throughout the document.

MPEP 2106 II. C. Review the claims

The claims define the property rights provided by a patent, and thus require careful scrutiny. The goal of claim analysis is to identify the boundaries of the protection sought by the applicant and to understand how the claims relate to and define what the applicant has indicated is the invention. Office personnel must first determine the scope of a claim by thoroughly analyzing the language of the claim before determining if the claim complies with each statutory requirement for patentability. See *In re Hiniker Co.*, 150 F.3d 1362, 1369, 47 USPQ2d 1523, 1529 (Fed. Cir. 1998) ("[T]he name of the game is the claim.").

Further, with regard to the rejection under 35 USC 103 over Silbiger taken with Buehler et al and Frische et al, applicants opine voluminously on the reference to Silbiger coming to a conclusion that "(n)o one really knows" what is actually the subject of the constituents' patent. Applicants argue that the reference fails to teach anything particularly substantial, failing to acknowledge what the Examiner has pointed out and for the reasons as expounded in the Final Rejection. The three references in the rejection under 35 USC 103 are drawn to identical compositions using the constituents recited herein for their art-recognized uses. Nothing more needs to be shown since the rejection was made under 35 USC 103. The use of a constituent for its art-recognized function is motivation to include that constituent in similar compositions.


No Declaration has been filed in this application, and none from any other application will be considered unless properly submitted. The Declaration in SN 09/857,611 is not a part of the record in the prosecution of this application. The Examiner is not aware of any rule that would make it so.

Art Unit: 1711

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan M. Nutter whose telephone number is 571-272-1076. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 a.m.-6:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James J. Seidleck can be reached on 571-272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Nathan M. Nutter
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1711

nmn

17 July 2007